UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,266	04/24/2001	Jeff Reynar	60001.0050US01	6006

27488 7590 04/19/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
SMITH, PETER J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/841,266	REYNAR, JEFF	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 February 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-28,30 and 31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-28,30 and 31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/5/04, 1/14/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 2/25/2005.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-28, 30, and 31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, and 28 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 16-18, and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard et al. (hereinafter "Beauregard"), US 5,974,413 patented 10/26/1999 in view of Perkowski, US 6,625,581 B1 filed 11/22/1999.

Regarding independent claim 1, Beauregard teaches receiving, in a recognizer, a string of text of an electronic document and annotating the string of text to determine whether the string includes any of a plurality of predetermined strings in the recognizer in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling the string of text in the electronic document with a label in col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches providing a list of actions associated with the string of text that may be performed in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches wherein the list of actions is provided in response to a user selecting a dropdown menu associated with the label in col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the recognizer is a plug-in software module. Beauregard does not

teach that the list of actions associated with the string of text are related to purchasing a product associated with the string of text. Perkowski does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches an applet providing a set actions related to an identified product to enable a user to purchase a related product in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable for one of ordinary skill to have used plug-in software modules to contain the code for the recognizer. Plug-in software was well known to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention and would have allowed for simple modification of and enhancement recognizer software code.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been product information or transaction actions related to a recognized product text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string is recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Beauregard.

Beauregard teaches analyzing a text string for action words as they are entered into the computer, but does teach a word archive in fig. 13, col. 34 lines 7-30, and col. 47 line 63 – col. 48 line 31. Beauregard teaches that the entire archive can be searched and analyzed. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have used the archive teaching of Beauregard to have stored an entire text string that could have been analyzed all at one time. This would have enabled the user to have viewed all the semantically labeled strings and one time, saving the user time in making label selections.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Beauregard teaches a recognizer for identifying a plurality of predetermined strings and presenting one or more actions when a predetermined string is identified in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the predetermined strings comprise a plurality of product names. Perkowski does teach a plurality of product identifiers that, when recognize, present a series of product related information to a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have created the combination to have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string is recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Beauregard.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7,

fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the action is connecting a web browser associated with the electronic system to a web site associated with the selected action. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the URL reference list of Perkowski to have enhanced the actions of Beauregard so that a web site related the to the identified product text string would have been retrieved on the user's computer so the user would have been presented with information related to the identified product.

Regarding dependent claims 5, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that an identifier of the user is stored in association with the label or actions and that the identifier is transmitted to the product related web site.

Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the URL reference list of Perkowski to have

enhanced the actions of Beauregard so that a web site related the to the identified product text string would have been retrieved on the user's computer.

Regarding independent claim 16, Beauregard teaches identifying a plurality of items in an electronic document, wherein the plurality of items are identified as matching at least one term in a database in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches providing, in association with at least one of the identified plurality of items, an action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches receiving an indication that the action has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the database is a product database. Beauregard does not teach that the selectable action is to buy all of the identified plurality of items. Beauregard does not teach sending a list of the identified plurality of items to a website associated with the e-commerce retailer. Beauregard does not teach sending an indication to buy all of the identified plurality of items to a website associated with the e-commerce retailer.

Perkowski teaches a product database and a list of associated websites for each product in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site identifies itself to the user. Beauregard teaches an applet enabling a user to purchase products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the associated product information and electronic

product purchasing teachings of Perkowski to have improved Beauregard so that the user would have been able to more efficiently procure desired products from the website retailer.

Beauregard teaches analyzing a text string for action words as they are entered into the computer, but does teach a word archive in fig. 13, col. 34 lines 7-30, and col. 47 line 63 – col. 48 line 31. Beauregard teaches that the entire archive can be searched and analyzed. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have used the archive teaching of Beauregard to have stored an entire text string that could have been analyzed all at one time. This would have enabled the user to have viewed all the semantically labeled strings and one time, saving the user time in making label selections.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Beauregard teaches wherein the step of identifying the plurality of items in an electronic document is performed by a recognizer module on a user's computer in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Beauregard teaches wherein the database is stored on the user's computer in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the product database comprises a list of product titles and product names found on the website associated with the e-commerce retailer. Perkowski teaches a product database using individual identification numbers to identify each of the products found on the website associated with the e-commerce retailer in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. It would have been obvious to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained a unique identification in the database for each of the available products so that the appropriate website

would have been presented to the user when the product was identified by the recognizer module.

Regarding independent claim 23, Beauregard teaches receiving, in a recognizer, a string of text of an electronic document and annotating the string of text to determine whether the string includes any of a plurality of predetermined strings in the recognizer in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling the string of text in the electronic document with a label in col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches providing a list of actions associated with the string of text that may be performed in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the recognizer is a plug-in software module. Beauregard does not teach that the list of actions associated with the string of text are related to purchasing a product associated with the string of text. Perkowski does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable for one of ordinary skill to have used plug-in software modules to contain the code for the recognizer. Plug-in software was well known to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention and would have allowed for simple modification of and enhancement recognizer software code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been web site links to product information or transaction actions related to a recognized product text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string is recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Beauregard.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Beauregard does not teach wherein the plurality of strings associated with shopping comprises variants of the strings "buy" and "sell". Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. This electronic-commerce enabled product catalog would include "buy" and "sell" actions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been options to buy or sell the product identified by the text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string was recognized to reduce the time the user spends on buying or selling the related product.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Beauregard does not teach wherein the plurality of strings associated with shopping comprises commerce-related strings. Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 1-2 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. This electronic-commerce enabled product catalog would include commerce-related actions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been commerce-related string options pertaining to the product identified by the text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is

mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string was recognized to reduce the time the user spends on commerce actions related to the product.

Regarding independent claim 26, Beauregard teaches tracking, in a recognizer module on a user's computer, all of the strings in a user's electronic document that match strings in a recognizer database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling the string of text in the electronic document with a label and providing a list of actions associated with the string of text that may be performed in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach transmitting, via a web browser, the list of matching strings to a retailer. Beauregard does teach that the associated list is a list of recommendations that are related to the list of matching strings.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list associated with the

recognized strings presented to the user would have been recommendations to the user related to the product identified by the text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related information and recommendations to be transmitted to the user when a product text string was recognized to reduce the time the user spends on commerce actions related to the product.

Beauregard teaches analyzing a text string for action words as they are entered into the computer, but does teach a word archive in fig. 13, col. 34 lines 7-30, and col. 47 line 63 – col. 48 line 31. Beauregard teaches that the entire archive can be searched and analyzed. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have used the archive teaching of Beauregard to have stored an entire text string that could have been analyzed all at one time. This would have enabled the user to have viewed all the semantically labeled strings and one time, saving the user time in making label selections.

Regarding independent claim 27, Beauregard teaches recognizing a string in an electronic document by comparing the string to a list of strings in a recognizer database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches providing a list of actions in association with the recognized string in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach in response to receiving an action to compare prices of a product string, polling a plurality of web sites that sell the product identified in the product string for a price. Beauregard does not teach receiving a plurality of prices from the web sites and displaying the prices.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list associated with the recognized strings presented to the user would have included an option to compare prices on the product. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed the user to have compared prices at various internet retailers for the particular product. This would have allowed the user to have pursued a transaction at the best available price.

Regarding independent claim 28, Beauregard teaches in a recognizer program module, determining whether a product string in an electronic document matches at least one string in a recognizer database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches if it matches, labeling the string with a semantic category, wherein the semantic category comprises a type label in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach

wherein the semantic category comprises a globally unique product identifier, wherein the globally unique product identifier uniquely identifies the recognition event of the product string

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches pairing an electronic-commerce product with a globally unique product identifier in the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the semantic category associated with the recognized strings presented to the user would have included both a type label and a globally unique product identifier. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed the user to have obtained an exact unique identifier for the identified product string.

Regarding dependent claims 30-31, Beauregard teaches in a recognizer program module, determining whether a product string in an electronic document matches at least one string in a recognizer database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches displaying a number of actions in association with the semantic category in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach sending the globally unique

product identifier to a website of a retailer or tracking the globally unique product identifier to determine the number times it has been used.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches pairing an electronic-commerce product with a globally unique product identifier in the abstract. This identifier is used to identify to associated web sites what product the user is interested in.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski utilizing a globally unique product identification to have enhanced Beauregard so that the semantic category associated with the recognized strings presented to the user would have displayed to the user a number of actions pertaining to a uniquely identified product. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the commerce information transaction method of Perkowski to have uniquely transmitted information regarding the product from the website to the user. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. It would have been obvious to have counted at the web site the number of times the globally unique product identifier was used so that the retailer would have known what products are popular and require the largest stock in inventory. The obvious combination of

Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed the user to have obtained unique commerce information for the uniquely identified product string.

5. Claims 6-15 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard et al. (hereinafter "Beauregard"), US 5,974,413 patented 10/26/1999 in view of Perkowski, US 6,625,581 B1 filed 11/22/1999 and Jovicic et al. (hereinafter "Jovicic"), US 5,855,007.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that an identifier of the user is stored in association with the label or actions and that the identifier is transmitted to the product related web site. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site identifies itself to the user. Jovicic teaches transmitting to a web site an identifier of a user so that the web site may generate and transmit customized information to the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have identified the user to the web site so that the web site would have presented information relevant and specific to the visiting user.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach in response to identifying the user providing a discount offer to the user. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site identifies itself to the user. Jovicic teaches transmitting to a web site an identifier of a user so that the web site may generate and transmit customized information to the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

Jovicic teaches providing a discount offer to a user in response to identifying the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-20 that the use of coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a discount offer to the user in response to the identified user visiting the web site. The offer would have increased the chance that the user visited the web site and would have thus increased web site hits. The increase in traffic would have led to greater revenues for the web site. It would have been obvious and desirable to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have presented the user with discount offers after selecting the appropriate action to increase traffic to the web site.

Regarding dependent claims 8-11, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in

fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach in response to identifying the user providing a discount offer to the user. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site identifies itself to the user. Jovicic teaches transmitting to a web site an identifier of a user so that the web site may generate and transmit customized information to the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

Jovicic teaches providing a coupon to an identified user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. Jovicic teaches that the coupon comprises an identification, discount value, and a begin and end date in fig. 3 and col. 6 line 49 – col. 7 line 40. Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-20 that the use of coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a coupon discount offer to the user in response to the identified user visiting the web site. The offer would have increased the chance that the user visited the web site and would have thus increased web site hits. The increase in traffic would have led to greater revenues for the web site. It would have been obvious and desirable to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have presented the user with discount offers after selecting the appropriate action to increase traffic to the web site.

Regarding independent claim 12, Beauregard using a recognizer module to determine a number of strings in a database that match at least one string in an electronic document in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling a matched string providing a plurality of actions in association with each recognized string in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col.

42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach determining whether the number of recognized strings exceeds a predetermined minimum and if so, providing a coupon as one of the plurality of actions. Perkowski does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a coupon discount offer to a user in response to identifying the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-20 that the use of coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a coupon discount offer to the user if the user was selecting a predetermined minimum number of product strings so that the user may be rewarded by the merchant for giving a high volume of business to the merchant. The offer would have increased the chance that the user would have selected that merchant's products again in the future.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Beauregard does not teach that the strings in the database comprise names of consumer products. Perkowski does teach storing identifications of consumer products in a database to point to related informational items in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. The combination would have enabled the user to more easily access information related to identified consumer products.

Regarding independent claim 14, Beauregard using a recognizer module to determine in an electronic document strings that match at least one string in a database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches applying a semantic category to each of the matches strings in the electronic document, wherein the semantic category comprises a type label identifying the type of the matches string in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Perkowski does teach storing identifications of consumer products in a database to point to related informational items in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches rewarding an identified visiting user with a discount offer in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have rewarded the identified user for referring business to a web site so that the user would be encouraged to referred business to the web site again in the future.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Beauregard teaches determining that an action associated with the semantic category has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach sending the affiliate number identification to the website. Jovicic teaches sending a user identification number to a website so that the website may provide the user with a discount offer. It would have been obvious and desirable to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have identified the user to the website so that the website could have produced and presented the user with the appropriate reward discount.

Regarding independent claim 19, Beauregard teaches cross-referencing a text string name with a type label database to determine whether the name matches at least one entry in the type label database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling the name with a type label if it matches, cross-referencing the type label with a plurality of actions to determine which actions match the type label, and listing the matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number of different actions in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the string name is a product name. Beauregard does not teach that the name is transmitted to the user from the retailer by email.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a product to a user via email in fig. 4, col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17, and particularly in col. 7 lines 41-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have presented the products to the users via email because it would have been a cost effective way to advertise products to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Beauregard teaches wherein cross-referencing a name with a type label database to determine whether the name matches at least one entry in the type label database is performed by a recognizer module on a computer in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Beauregard teaches wherein cross-referencing a type label with a plurality of actions to determine which actions match the type label and listing the

matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number of different actions are performed by an action module on the computer in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21.

Regarding independent claim 22, Beauregard teaches a type label associated with a name in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches cross-referencing a type label with a plurality of actions to determine which actions match the type label, and listing the matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number of different actions in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the string name is a product name. Beauregard does not teach that the name and associated type label are transmitted to the user from the retailer by email.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a product to a user via email in fig. 4, col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17, and particularly in col. 7 lines 41-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have presented the products to the users via email because it would have been a cost effective way to advertise products to the user.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2/25/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 10-13 that Beauregard et al. (hereinafter "Beauregard") and Perkowski do not teach all the limitations of independent claims 1, 16, and

26, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Regarding the argument that neither reference teaches a drop down menu, Beauregard does teach in col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21 that more than one action can be associated with an action word and any time two or more actions are associated with an action word, a drop down menu is provided to the user to make the final selection. Regarding the argument that neither reference teaches receiving a string of text in a recognizer plug-in after the entire string of text has been entered in an electronic document and determining whether the string includes any of a plurality of predetermined strings, the Examiner believes Beauregard discloses sufficient teachings to implement this feature. The embodiment disclosed by Beauregard does continuously analyze a string of text looking for action words and does not wait until the entire string is entered. However, Beauregard also teaches a text archive in fig. 13, col. 34 lines 7-30, and col. 47 line 63 – col. 48 line 31 which can be searched and analyzed after the text has been input. Beauregard's motivation for invention is to reduce user keystrokes and make user-computer interaction more efficient. The Examiner believes the teachings Beauregard regarding recognizing action words in an input string and a text archive in light of the motivation of Beauregard to make user-computer interactions more efficient would have made it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have analyzed a completed text string for action words. The advantage is that the user could then interact with all of the action words at one time, instead of repeatedly stopping to interact with recognized action words.

Regarding Applicant's argument in pages 13 and 14 that Beauregard and Perkowski do not teach all the limitations of independent claim 23, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Perkowski does teach URL addresses associated with products in fig. 4. Beauregard discloses that websites can be navigated to by use of the action words in fig. 31. Thus, the two references

are amenable to a combination since Beauregard can use a recognized word to point to a website and Perkowski teaches how to point to a website associated with a product.

Regarding Applicant's argument in pages 15 and 16 that Beauregard and Perkowski do not teach the all the limitations of independent claim 28, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner believes Perkowski does teach that a product string is "recognized" if the string matches at least one string from a recognizer database. Perkowski shows a data table used to identify and provide detailed information for a GUID in fig. 4. Using the teaching of Beauregard, a GUID such as is taught by Perkowski, can be attached to any word.

Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 17 and 18 that Beauregard, Perkowski, and Jovicic do not teach all the limitations of independent claim 12, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user, Beauregard actually provides the teaching of a recognizer module determining matching strings in an electronic document. Therefore, the combination of references as set forth by Examiner relies on the string matching as taught by Beauregard, but relies on Perkowski for the substance of that matching string, which is a globally unique identifier. Therefore, this combination of the teachings of Beauregard and Perkowski does in fact teach the limitations as claimed.

Regarding Applicant's argument in pages 18 and 19 that Beauregard, Perkowski, and Jovicic do not teach all the limitations of independent claim 14, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Perkowski teaches recording affiliate data for example in fig. 4D, wherein a retailer's associated manufacturing companies are stored in a database table linked to the globally unique identifier. Therefore, Perkowski does in fact teach maintaining affiliate information and the

teaching of Beauregard would have enabled the affiliate number to have been associated with an electronic document.

Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 19-21 that Beauregard, Perkowski, and Jovicic do not teach all the limitations of independent claims 19 and 22, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner believes Beauregard discloses sufficient teachings to implement receiving a string of text in a recognizer module after the entire string of text has been entered in an electronic document and determining whether the string includes any of a plurality of predetermined strings. The embodiment disclosed by Beauregard does continuously analyze a string of text looking for action words and does not wait until the entire string is entered. However, Beauregard also teaches a text archive in fig. 13, col. 34 lines 7-30, and col. 47 line 63 – col. 48 line 31 which can be searched and analyzed after the text has been input. Beauregard's motivation for invention is to reduce user keystrokes and make user-computer interaction more efficient. The Examiner believes the teachings Beauregard regarding recognizing action words in an input string and a text archive in light of the motivation of Beauregard to make user-computer interactions more efficient would have made it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have analyzed a completed text string for action words. The advantage is that the user could then interact with all of the action words at one time, instead of repeatedly stopping to interact with recognized action words.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
4/15/2005

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER